

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-10 are rejected.

Claim 1 have been amended. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings, as originally filed.

Specification Objections

The Office Action objected to the specification because of some informalities as presented in the cross-reference section and the abstract. Applicant has reviewed these informalities and has corrected the specification in a manner consistent with what the Examiner suggested in the Office Action. Applicant believes that the amendments to the specification which correct the informalities introduces no new matter; therefore, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Applicant has also filed a supplemental information disclosure statement in response to the Office Action. Included in the supplemental information disclosure statement is a concise explanation of the cited foreign references.

Rejection of Claims 1, 4, 6, and 8-10 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 4, 6, and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,545,418 to Kolpasky. The Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 4, 6, and 8-10. The law is clear

that anticipation requires that a single prior art reference disclose each and every limitation of the claim sought to be rejected. 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). The law is also clear that a claim in dependent form shall be construed to incorporate all the limitations of the claim to which it refers. 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4.

Claim 1 has been amended and now claims at least one light source (21) being installed on the chassis (13) outside of the diaphragm (14) and connected to the direct-current network of the vehicle. In other words, at least one light source (21) is installed in the chassis (13) outside the diaphragm (14), and at least one light source (21) is electrically connected to the direct-current network of the vehicle. By contrast, Kolpasky discloses a flat panel speaker with a closed housing (14), where the light sources (27) are arranged. Electrically, the light sources (27) are connected with three lines (40, 42, 44) to a controller (32). Thus, the installation involves a great outlay. The present invention solves this problem by using a loudspeaker that has a chassis (13), wherein a light source (21) is installed in the chassis (13) outside the diaphragm (14). Thus, the loudspeaker is compact, and requires little installation outlay. Furthermore, Kolpasky does not disclose whether the light sources (27) are fixed to any part of the housing (14).

The amendment to claim 1 that states that the light source is connected outside the diaphragm is supported by the specification as originally filed. The light sources (21) on the chassis (13) “are, for example, soldered in place on the chassis (13) outside the diaphragm opening (16).” ¶ [0020]. In other words, the light source (21) being placed outside the diaphragm opening (16) is located outside the diaphragm (14). In addition, Figures 1-5 also support the amendment to claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that there is ample support for the amendment to claim 1.

The amendment to claim 1 that states that the light source (21) is connected to the direct-current network is supported by the specification as originally filed. "If an active loudspeaker is employed in the speaker unit, it will require an electrical connection to the direct-current network on board the motor vehicle." ¶ [0008]. Thus, the current supply of the light sources (21) can be realized via electrical connections, which are connected to the direct-current network on board the motor vehicle. Furthermore, paragraph [0020] mentions that one electrical connection of each light-emitting diode (21) is electrically conductively connected to the chassis (13) of the speaker (11), while the other electrical connection is connected to the electrical connection bar of the speaker (11). Such an electrical wiring of the light source (21) only works, if the chassis (13) is on mass potential of a direct-current source. This describes at least analogically that the light source (21) is being connected to the direct-current network of the motor vehicle. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that there is ample support for the amendment to claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 defines over the art cited by the Examiner and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection. Likewise, claims 4, 6, and 8-10, which depend from claim 1, further define the invention and define over the art cited by the Examiner. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Furthermore, the Applicant submits that U.S. Patent No. 6,545,418 to Kolpasky does not render claims 1, 4, 6, and 8-10 obvious. Applicant respectfully asserts that Kolpasky does not teach, suggest, or motivate one having ordinary skill in the art, a light source installed outside the diaphragm and connected to the direct-current network of the vehicle.

Rejection of Claims 2, 3, 5, and 7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,545,418 to Kolpasky in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,964,519 to Chun-Ying. The standard for obviousness is that there must be some suggestion, either in the reference or in the relevant art, of how to modify what is disclosed to arrive at the claimed invention. In addition, “[s]omething in the prior art as a whole must suggest the desirability, and thus, the obviousness, of making” the modification to the art suggested by the Examiner. *Uniroyal, Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp.*, 837 F.2d 1044, 1051, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1434, 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The law is also clear that a claim in dependent form shall be construed to incorporate all the limitations of the claim to which it refers. 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4. The Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 2, 3, 5 and 7.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 is not obvious because claim 2 also includes the limitations of amended claim 1 which the Applicant respectfully maintains is not obvious in view of Kolpasky. Since, Kolpasky does not render claim 1 obvious, then claim 2 is not obvious with respect to Kolpasky in view of Chun-Ying. Furthermore, Chun-Ying discloses a reading lamp with a music box, wherein a night lamp (5) is arranged under a fragrance holder (4). Kolpasky in view of Chun-Ying does not teach, motivate, or suggest the combination of a light (5) that is screwably secured to a light holder in a speaker unit. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 is not obvious, and request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,545,418 to Kolpasky in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,283,414 to Quinones. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 is not obvious because claim 3 includes the limitations of amended claim 1, which the Applicant respectfully maintains

is not obvious in view of Kolpasky. Moreover, Kolpasky in view of Quinones discloses soldering leads of a light bulb to a conductor on a kite. Thus, Kolpasky in view of Quinones, does not teach, motivate, or suggest the soldering of a light source to a chassis of a speaker unit. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 is not obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,545,418 to Kolpasky in view of U.S. Patent 6,158,869 to Barnes. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5 and 7 are not obvious because claims 5 and 7 include the limitations of amended claim 1, which the Applicant respectfully maintains is not obvious in view of Kolpasky. Furthermore, claim 5 is not obvious because Barnes relates to a speaker grille and neither Barnes nor Kolpasky teaches, motivates, or suggests the arrangement of diodes on a speaker unit as described in claim 5. Likewise, claim 7 is not obvious because Barnes relates to a speaker grille and neither Kolpasky nor Barnes teaches, motivates, or suggests the combination of a dispersion disk and a speaker unit. Moreover, Barnes discloses a flashlight mounted centrally on a command unit, wherein the flashlight is electrically connected to the supply lines of the loudspeaker, which is alternating current. The present invention solves this problem by connecting the light source (21) outside the diaphragm (14) so that the light source (21) can be connected to the direct-current network of the vehicle. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5 and 7 are not obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 3, 5, and 7 define over the art cited by the Examiner and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection. Moreover, claims 2, 3, 5, and 7, which depend from claim 1, further define

the invention and include the limitations of claim 1 and thus define over the art cited by the Examiner. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the above amendments and remarks the claims 1-10, as presented, are patentably distinguishable because the cited patents, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest or render obvious, the present invention. Therefore, Applicant submits that the pending claims are properly allowable, which allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicant's undersigned attorney at (248) 364-4300 if any unresolved matters remain.

Respectfully submitted,

WARN, HOFFMANN, MILLER & LALONE, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By: 

Philip R. Warn
Reg. No. 32775

P.O. Box 70098
Rochester Hills, MI 48307
(248) 364-4300

Dated: November 3, 2005

PRW:SPR:slm